



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

under the New York Stock Corporation Laws. But as the bank was *bona fide*, these payments were not voidable as a preference under the bankruptcy laws. The trustee in bankruptcy brought an action to recover these payments from the bank. *Held*, that he cannot recover. *Irish v. Citizens Trust Co.*, 163 Fed. 880 (Dist. Ct., N. D. N. Y., Aug., 1908).

If the checks had not been given, the deposit would have been subject to a banker's lien, which is not the technical lien, but a mere right of set-off as to any matured debt due the bank. *Bank v. Brewing Co.*, 50 Oh. St. 151. Under the bankruptcy laws, the bank could have set off any matured debt, even against deposits made within four months of bankruptcy. *New York County Nat'l Bank v. Massey*, 192 U. S. 138. The deposit of money in a bank creates the relation of debtor and creditor, so the effect of the checks given was to decrease the obligation of the bank to the depositor. *Marine Bank v. Fulton Bank*, 2 Wall. (U. S.) 252. See *Bank v. Brewing Co.*, *supra*. But the trustee, having elected to treat these checks as void, the obligation of the bank to the depositor revived and the notes remained unpaid. And no preference existed to prevent the bank from setting up as against the trustee any claim it might possess against the depositor. The bank's right of setting off against the notes was, therefore, properly held to defeat the trustee.

BANKS AND BANKING—DEPOSITS—EFFECT OF FAILURE OF DEPOSITOR TO NOTIFY BANK OF FORGERIES.—A depositor discovered that his bank had paid and charged to his account forged checks. He failed to notify the bank promptly of the forgeries. *Held*, that he cannot recover from the bank, irrespective of whether it could have protected itself had it been promptly notified. *McNeely Co. v. Bank of North America*, 70 Atl. 891 (Pa.).

A depositor is not chargeable with any payments by his bank except such as are made in conformity with his orders. *Shipman v. State Bank*, 126 N. Y. 318. But he owes to the bank the duty of examining returned vouchers and reporting forgeries. *First Nat. Bank v. Allen*, 100 Ala. 476. *A fortiori* is it his duty to give prompt notice when he knows of the forgeries. *Dana v. Nat. Bank of the Republic*, 132 Mass. 156. The question, then, is whether a depositor who fails in this duty is estopped from claiming from the bank the amounts wrongly paid. Forbearance to exercise a right in reliance on the wrongful act of another is sufficient basis for an estoppel. *Voorhis v. Olmstead*, 66 N. Y. 113. The right to seek restoration from a forger is, in itself, a valuable one, and the depositor should be barred if it appears that owing to his wrongful acts the bank omitted to exercise that right promptly or effectively. *Leather Manufacturers' Bank v. Morgan*, 117 U. S. 96. The law assumes that had notice been given promptly, steps might have been taken to protect the bank. See *United Security, etc., Co. v. Central Nat. Bank*, 185 Pa. 596. The present case seems to fall directly within this reasoning.

CANCELLATION OF INSTRUMENTS—DEEDS: RESTORATION IN STATU QUO.—The plaintiff filed a bill for the cancellation of a deed to the defendant, which the defendant by duress had induced her to execute and deliver before her marriage to him. The defendant contended that, as the marriage was the sole consideration for the deed, restoration *in statu quo* was impossible, and that therefore the bill must fail. *Held*, that in spite of the plaintiff's inability to make any restoration, the court may order the deed cancelled. *Ring v. Ring*, 127 N. Y. App. Div. 411.

On the broad ground that he who seeks equity must do equity, it is the general rule that a party seeking to rescind a contract must restore the other party *in statu quo*. *Felt v. Bell*, 205 Ill. 213. But since the object of the rule is to do justice, it must not be carried too far: substantial restoration is all that should be required. *Mather v. Barnes*, 146 Fed. 1000, 1019. Even this will not be necessary where the wrongdoer by his own act has made impossible more than a partial restoration; for then all that can in fairness be asked is restoration to the extent of the plaintiff's ability. *Buller v. Prentiss*, 158 N. Y. 49. It follows logically, and as a final limitation of the doctrine of restoration, that if the wrongdoer has complicated matters so that no restoration at all is possible,